

### REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed September 11, 2007. This Reply encompasses a bona fide attempt to overcome the rejections raised by the Examiner and presents amendments as well as reasons why Applicant believes that the claimed invention, as amended, is novel and unobvious over the applied prior art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

### Interview Summary

Pursuant to Applicant Initiated Interview Request submitted on November 9, 2007, a telephonic interview was conducted November 15, 2007 between Examiner Oanh Duong, Attorney Christopher Glover and Attorney Katharina Schuster. Differences between embodiments of claim 1 and the Cofino reference were discussed with Examiner Duong. No agreement was reached. Applicant appreciates the time taken by Examiner Duong to discuss the claim scope of the pending claims and review Applicant's present application.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,996,536 ("Cofino"). The rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent claims 5, 11 and 17 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1. Thus, traversal of the rejections with respect to independent claims 5, 11 and 17 will be collectively discussed hereinafter with respect to independent claim 1.

The standard for "anticipation" is one of fairly strict identity. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), MPEP § 2131. See also MPEP 706.02(IV). Thus, Cofino does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) unless Cofino either expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in claim 1.

Claim 1 recites:

A method of associating requests and events comprising:  
logging events at one or more servers, wherein initiation of said events includes generation of dynamic content according to one or more scripts at the one or more servers and activities initiated in response to a user's browsing behavior;  
receiving a set of HTTP request data which includes, for each HTTP request in a set of HTTP requests, a request time stamp, and a string indicating said each HTTP request or a logical page corresponding to said each HTTP request;  
receiving a set of event data which includes, for each of said logged events, an event time stamp and data corresponding to execution of said one or more scripts; and  
associating each of said logged events with a previous HTTP request from the set of HTTP requests that has a request time stamp being closest in time to the event time stamp of the event.

To expedite prosecution, claim 1 is amended herein to make the implicit explicit. Particularly, claim 1 recites, among others, "logging events at one or more servers, wherein initiation of said events includes generation of dynamic content according to one or more scripts at the one or more servers and activities initiated in response to a user's browsing behavior." See Specification, paragraphs 28-29 and 42.

By contrast, Cofino teaches tracking web pages that a user visits, the various links of the visited web pages and the basket placement or purchase of various products. See Cofino, figures 4, 5 and 6. Cofino does not appear to be concerned with what dynamic content was seen by the user or which backend business processes were affected by the user's browsing behavior. Applicant is unable to find in Cofino regarding logging the generation of dynamic content and receiving information regarding the same. For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and dependent claims 2-4 are not anticipated by Cofino under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and therefore should be allowed. For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 11 and 17 and dependent claims 6-10, 12-16 and 18-20 recite subject matter not reached by Cofino under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and therefore should be allowed. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include any acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-20. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

**Sprinkle IP Law Group**  
Attorneys for Applicant



Katharina Schuster  
Reg. No. 50,000


Date: Dec. 6, 2007

1301 W. 25<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 408  
Austin, TX 78705  
Tel. (512) 637-9220  
Fax. (512) 371-9088



Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as Express Mail No. EV 927 719 665 US to the United States Patent Office on **December 11, 2007**.

  
Stacy Sutton Kerby